



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,661	10/31/2001	Akira Sugiyama	450100-03598	2440
20/999 7590 04/08/2008 FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151				
EXAMINER CZEKAJ, DAVID J				
ART UNIT 2621		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/08/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/002,661

Applicant(s)

SUGIYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID CZEKAJ

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/15/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanco et al. (6493041), (hereinafter referred to as "Hanco") in view of Matsumura et al. (US 5,835,144) in further view of Machino et al. (4719620), (hereinafter referred to as "Machino") in further view of Acampora et al. (4827336), (hereinafter referred to as "Acampora").

As for Claim's 1 and 4, Hanko teaches an input means for inputting the input data (Hanko: figures 1-2), start detecting means for detecting the start of the predetermined unit of the input data, in which the predetermined unit corresponds to a frame (Hanko: column 8, lines 23-40, wherein the digitizer detects the start of the frames), means for receiving a frame end signal indicative of the end of a number of frames (Hanko: column 8, lines 45-50), and end detecting means for detecting the end of a respective frame based on the frame end signal wherein data received after the frame end signal and before the start of a next frame is not processed and is designated invalid (Hanko: column 8, lines 45-67; column 10, lines 8-15, wherein the synchronization signal indicates the end of the frame). However, Hanko fails to disclose the signal processing and frame processing as claimed. Matsumura teaches that it would be desirable to reduce data substitution through the use of self-resynchronizing variable length codes (Matsumura: column 1, lines 39-42). To help alleviate this problem, Matsumura discloses signal processing means for making an action on the variable length code active at the start detected by the start detecting means (Matsumura: Column 8, lines 38-64), for making the action on the variable length code inactive at the end detected by the end detecting means (Matsumura: Column 10, lines 51-59; Column 9, lines 35-50), and for initializing the state of the action on the variable length code at the end detected by the end detecting means (Matsumura: Column 6, lines 55-65). Machino teaches that there is a need in the art to avoid collisions (Machino: column 1, lines 10-24). To help

alleviate this problem, Machino discloses when the start of the frame is not detected, data received is designated invalid allowing immediate processing of the next frame thereby eliminating invalid data and reducing further lost data (Machino: column 3, lines 43-50, wherein the start of frame is the frame-start signal, wherein if the signal is not detected, the next frame is immediately processed) and signal based on the start code (Machino: figure 5, wherein the signal is the signal on the bus). Acampora teaches the level of an enable signal is altered between a high and low level based on a frame end signal (Acampora: column 15, lines 51-65, wherein the enable signal must be altered between a high and low state to correctly activate the read and write enable signals). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Hanko and add the processing taught by Matsumura, Machino, and Acampora, in order to obtain an apparatus the produces accurate results.

As for Claim 2, Hanko teaches the input data comprises MPEG data (Hanko: column 2, lines 45-46).

As for Claim's 3 and 5, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to record the output data (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to save the data for future use.

As for Claim 7, many of the limitations have been addressed in the above rejections. In addition, Matsumura et al. teach suspending processing for a period of time, the period of time being from the end of frame data to a

subsequent start signal, when an error is detected (Matsumura: Column 8, line 65 to Column 9, line 29), detecting a start code for a corrected stream of data (Matsumura: Column 9, lines 26-29), and re-initiating the processing step as a function of the detecting step (Matsumura: Column 9, lines 26-57).

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanks et al. (6493041), (hereinafter referred to as "Hanks") in view of Matsumura et al. (US 5,835,144) in further view of Machino et al. (4719620), (hereinafter referred to as "Machino") in further view of Acampora et al. (4827336), (hereinafter referred to as "Acampora") in further view of Ching et al. (US 3,971,888).

As for claim 6, Hanks in view of Matsumura et al. in view of Machino in view of Acampora fail to specifically teach where the means for receiving includes a flip-flop circuit, but Ching et al. does (Ching: Column 15, lines 4-37). Since the flip-flop circuit can be used to control how the signal is received by energizing and de-energizing the circuit, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a simple flip-flop circuit or any other type of circuit that would be capable of controlling when the circuit is energized or not in order to control when the signal is received.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CZEKAJ whose telephone number is (571)272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Czekaj/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621